

**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS**  
**Washington, D.C. 20231**

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/339,616      06/24/99      ALLEN

Y 1009.004C1P

**EXAMINER**

022469 MM91/0601  
SCHNADER HARRISON SEGAL & LEWIS, LLP  
1600 MARKET STREET  
SUITE 3600  
PHILADELPHIA PA 19103

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED:

06/01/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/339,616

Applicant(s)  
MARK ALLEN

Examiner  
Tuyet Vo

Group Art Unit  
2821

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuyet Vo

(3) Mr. Gerard Weiser

(2) Don Wong

(4) Mr. Robert McKinley

Date of Interview 24 May 2000

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ Was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

US. Pat 5,941,626.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant's representatives detail the distinction between the claimed invention particularly noted in claim 1 over 5941626. It is agreed that all materials of discussion will be given a thorough consideration upon receiving a written response to the examiner's final office action. All materials discussed during this interview will be summarized for further consideration. Applicant submits that the 102 rejection is not made with claim 1 due to the recited requirement of a resistor in the circuit. Therefore the depend claims are also patentable. We respectfully underscore that on pg 3 of the office action there is no citation to the elimination of a resistor. Claim 1 as amended does not show a negative limitation. It shows a direct connection to an AC source. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☒ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Don Wong  
Don Wong  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800